

SECURITY COMMITTEE MEETING

27 FEBRUARY 1980

PRELIMINARY

10450

1. BRIEFING OF SCC/CIWG AND OF SCC ON SECURITY ISSUES
(SUGGEST YOU DISCUSS 5 FEBRUARY BRIEFING BY MR. GAMBINO
OF SCC COUNTERINTELLIGENCE WORKING GROUP ON DIFFERENCES
IN COMMUNITY PERSONNEL SECURITY INVESTIGATIVE AND CLEARANCE
STANDARDS, THEIR COUNTERINTELLIGENCE IMPLICATIONS, AND
PROSPECTS FOR THEIR SOLUTION; SUGGEST ALSO DISCUSS
14 FEBRUARY DISCUSSION BY SCC ITSELF ON POSSIBLE REQUIRE-

STATINTL



CIA 2. NOFORN ISSUE IN DCID 1/7. "AN AD HOC GROUP OF
COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES MET ON 15 FEBRUARY AND TENTATIVELY
AGREED TO CHANGES TO THE NOFORN CONTROL IN THE PROPOSED
REVISION OF DCID 1/7. THE CHANGES RETAIN THE CONTROL
SUBJECT TO SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR ITS USE AND TO SIO'S
ISSUING INTERNAL GUIDANCE ON WHEN IT MAY BE APPLIED.
AFTER COORDINATION BY AD HOC GROUP MEMBERS IS COMPLETED,
THE SUGGESTED NEW LANGUAGE WILL BE SUBMITTED TO SECOM
MEMBERS."

OSD HAS NO OBJECTION TO DECLASSIFICATION AND RELEASE.

OSD review(s) completed.

3. GAO SURVEY OF CONTRACTORS. "MAYNARD ANDERSON ADVISED US THAT GAO WILL BE SENDING A QUESTIONNAIRE TO SOME 600-700 CONTRACTORS SEEKING STATISTICAL DATA ON BOTH SCI AND COLLATERAL "CARVE-OUT" CONTRACTS. AS WE UNDERSTAND IT, RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ARE OPTIONAL FOR THE CONTRACTORS ADDRESSED. IF THEY HAVE SECURITY CONCERNS ABOUT RESPONSES, THEY SHOULD CONSULT THEIR SECURITY OFFICERS."

4. STATUS OF APEX (SUGGEST YOU ASK [REDACTED] STAT
SUMMARIZE DEVELOPMENTS AND ACTIONS SINCE 30 JANUARY SECOM MEETING).

STATINTL 5. [REDACTED] WHO IS HEAD OF THE COMPARTMENTATION
BRANCH FOR THE STAFF, IS RETIRING AT THE END OF THIS
WEEK. WE WISH HIM GOD SPEED.

STAT

Approved For Release 2002/08/21 : CIA-RDP85-00821R000100040013-8

Approved For Release 2002/08/21 : CIA-RDP85-00821R000100040013-8

ITEM 3 - PROPOSED SECRECY AGREEMENT

"THREE WEEKS AGO WE SENT YOU A DRAFT SECRECY AGREEMENT DEVELOPED BY THE COMPARTMENTATION SUBCOMMITTEE. THEY HAD BEEN TASKED LATE LAST YEAR TO REVIEW THE CURRENT FORM 4066, NONDISCLOSURE AGREEMENT FOR SCI, AND DEVELOP A UNIFORM MODEL FOR COMMUNITY USE. THEIR OBJECTIVE WAS AN AGREEMENT WRITTEN IN EVERY DAY LANGUAGE AND COVERING ALL THE ELEMENTS DEEMED LEGALLY NECESSARY, FOR USE AS A MINIMUM FORM THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY. THE CONSIDERATION IN THE PROPOSED AGREEMENT IS ACCESS. FOR THOSE AGENCIES WHERE EMPLOYMENT ITSELF IS THE CONSIDERATION, AN APPROPRIATE MODIFICATION TO THE LANGUAGE WOULD BE IN ORDER. I UNDERSTAND THAT THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT HAS SUGGESTED THAT GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN THE EXCEPTED SERVICE MAY BE SUBJECTED TO AN EMPLOYMENT CONSIDERATION (CURRENT AS WELL AS NEW EMPLOYEES) THE SAME AS IF THEY WORKED FOR CIA OR NSA. THAT IS A MATTER TO BE WORKED OUT BY SUCH AGENCIES AS DIA."

STAT

"NSA HAS STATED SOME OBJECTIONS TO THIS PROPOSAL."
(SUGGEST YOU ASK NSA REP. TO SUMMARIZE THEIR VIEWS, AND THEN OPEN DISCUSSION WITH A VIEW TO GETTING MEMBER AGREEMENT TO APPROVAL OF THIS AGREEMENT AS A RECOMMENDED MINIMUM FOR COMMUNITY USE. JERRY RUBINO HAS SOME COMMENTS ON DEPT OF JUSTICE REVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL.)

ITEM 4 - SECOM SEMINAR

"AS MEMBERS KNOW, ADMINISTRATIVE CIRCUMSTANCES FORCED CANCELLATION OF THE SECOM SEMINAR PLANNED FOR 1-3 APRIL. THE BASIC REASON FOR THE CANCELLATION IS THAT WE DO NOT YET HAVE A FORMAL DESIGNATION OF A CHAIRMAN. THE DCI OPENED UP TO THE COMMUNITY SUGGESTIONS FOR A REPLACEMENT FOR BOB GAMBINO. IT JUST ISN'T FEASIBLE TO WORK TOWARD AND COMPLETE AN EFFECTIVE SEMINAR AGENDA WHILE THIS PROCESS IS GOING ON. WE ARE NOT IN A POSITION NOW TO PROJECT WHETHER WE CAN TRY TO RE-SCHEDULE THE SEMINAR FOR LATER IN THE YEAR."

"YOUR SUGGESTIONS ON AGENDA TOPICS ARE STILL ENCOURAGED. THEY WILL HELP US FOCUS ON THOSE ISSUES THAT WE NEED TO CONCENTRATE ON."

Cancelled

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
Security Committee

SECOM-D-098

25 February 1980

NOTE FOR: Members, DCI Security Committee

SUBJECT: SECURITY POLICY ON UNOFFICIAL TRAVEL TO THE USSR (U)

1. The staff was tasked at the 30 January 1980 Security Committee meeting to prepare an issues and options paper bearing on a possible Community security policy prohibiting unofficial travel to the USSR. (U)

3. In view of the premise for DCID 1/20, any proposed revision of its provisions bearing on the USSR should consider whether there have been any changes in the security threat. Checks with the Department of State (Special Assignments Staff), Defense Intelligence Agency (Counterintelligence and Security Staff), and CIA show that there

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

have been no reported changes in incidents in the USSR of actual or potential security concern involving Americans on unofficial travel. There have been reports of intensified surveillance of military attaches on official travel near Soviet military installations. This may reflect Soviet sensitivity to Western observation of their military preparations. Earlier expectations that the Soviets would intensify their internal security surveillance for tourists visiting the USSR for the Olympics have not been realized. There is thus no explicit factual basis for proposing that minimum Community security policy prohibit unofficial travel to the USSR. (C) //

4. Options available to the Security Committee include:

a. Do nothing on unofficial travel. This would leave each Community agency free to supplement the provisions of DCID 1/20 for its own personnel. (U)

b. Recommend to the DCI a specific security policy issuance, separate from DCID 1/20, prohibiting unofficial travel to the USSR by

25X6 [redacted] This would be premised upon a presumed, future increase in Soviet intelligence activities directed against Americans traveling within the USSR. Such a policy could be vulnerable to legal challenge if the postulated security threat did not materialize. A variant of this would be to propose an amendment to DCID 1/20 to accomplish the same purpose. (U)

c. Defer taking action on this issue until we have had opportunity to determine if and how the Soviets plan to retaliate against U.S. pressures (e.g., for withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan; boycott of Olympics) by increased security incidents involving Americans in the USSR. (U)

*Status quo -
no change in policy
subject - Security Incidents.*

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~



POLICY REVIEW

Approved For Release 2002/08/21 : CIA-RDP85-00821R000100040013-8
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY FOR DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20301

14 February 1980


MEMORANDUM FOR THE DIRECTOR, DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
DIRECTOR, DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Subject: Assistance to the General Accounting Office

The General Accounting Office is conducting an inquiry concerning classification management among Defense contractors and proposes to send the attached portion of a questionnaire to 600-700 contractor facilities. As you can see, it solicits statistical information concerning both Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) and non-SCI "carve-out" contracts. Informally, some contractor representatives have indicated a reluctance to provide the information requested.

Mr. Irving T. Boker, Team Director, General Accounting Office, has assured me that substantive information concerning the contracts involved will not be sought and that contractor responses will be held in complete confidence. If classification is imposed on the contractor submission, it will be honored by the General Accounting Office. Mr. Boker will share the results of the inquiry with us and respect any proscriptions that we might impose on use of the information.

I propose to advise Mr. Boker that he may distribute the questionnaire with the advice that the Department of Defense concurs in the inquiry if you have no objections.


Maynard Anderson
Deputy Director for
Security Policy

SPECIAL ACCESS PROGRAMS

Special Access programs may be grouped into the following types:

Type 1 - those ~~which are~~ considered to be sensitive compartmental information (SCI) or carveouts

Type 2 - those ~~which are~~ not SCI or carveouts

In answering questions 50 to 53 please consider those special access programs ongoing at your facility on December 31, 1979.

NOTE: The Director of the Information Security Oversight Office said he knew of no restrictions on the type of data requested in questions 50 to 53. DOD officials also assured us that there were no restrictions on contractors providing the type of information requested below.

50. How many Type 1 and Type 2 Special Access programs did you have ongoing at your facility on December 31, 1979. (Enter numbers. If none enter 0. If you had no special access program enter 0 for both and skip to question 54.)

_____ Type 1 - (SCI and/or carveouts)

_____ Type 2 - (non SCI or carveouts)

51. How many classified documents did you have in your possession on December 31, 1979 for these types of Special Access programs? (Enter numbers. If none, enter 0.)

_____ Documents Type 1 (SCI and/or carveouts)

_____ Documents Type 2 (non SCI or carveouts)

52. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the classification guidance you have received for these special access programs. (Check one for each.)

	Very 1. satisfied	Generally 2. satisfied	Neither satisfied nor 3. dissatisfied	Generally 4. dissatisfied	Very 5. dissatisfied	No basis to 6. judge
Type 1 (SCI-carveouts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Type 2 (non SCI-carveouts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

53. How often, if ever, do sponsor agencies generally inspect the classified documents in these special access programs. (Check one for each.)

	1-3 mos	4-6 mos	7-9 mos	EVERY 10-12 mos	13-18 mos	19-24 mos	25+ mos	Not Inspected
Type 1 (SCI or carveout)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Type 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS

54. If you have any comments and/or suggestions regarding the issues addressed in this questionnaire or related matters, please provide them below.

ITEM 1 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES

WE HAVE RECEIVED NO COMMENTS ON THE MINUTES OF THE
LAST REGULAR MEETING, HELD ON 30 JANUARY. IN THE ABSENCE
OF REQUESTS FOR CHANGE, THEY STAND APPROVED AS WRITTEN.